

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

EBONI D. LUCAS, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

MGM RESORTS INTERNATIONAL, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:20-cv-01750-JAD-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 130]

Pending before the Court is Defendants' motion to calculate fees. Docket No. 130. The motion does not include points and authorities, *but see* Local Rule 7-2(d), does not include meaningful argument to justify the fees sought, *but see Kor Media Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D. Nev. 2013), and does not include evidentiary support for the fees sought, *but see Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 895 n.11 (1984) (explaining that "the burden is on the fee applicant to produce satisfactory evidence" of the prevailing market rate); *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 437 (1983) ("the fee applicant bears the burden of . . . documenting the appropriate hours expended and hourly rates").<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the motion to calculate fees is **DENIED** without prejudice. Any renewed motion to calculate fees must be filed by February 9, 2023.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 7, 2023

  
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> The motion indicates that Defendants will provide support for the fee request *in camera* if ordered by the Court. Docket No. 130 at 2. No showing has been made that such information is properly submitted *in camera*, as opposed to filing it on the docket. *Cf. Garcia v. Service Emps. Int'l Union*, 2018 WL 10730805, at \*2 n.5 (D. Nev. Sept 21, 2018) (addressing disfavored status of *in camera* submissions).